

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 3, 2005. Claims 1-15 remain pending in this application. Claims 1-12 have been allowed and Claims 13-15 have been objected to and also rejected. Applicant has amended Claim 13. No new matter has been added.

On the merits, the Office Action rejected Claims 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 13-15 have been objected to for lack of antecedent basis in Claim 13. Claim 13 has been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for "first memory access means" as requested by the Examiner.

Applicants traverse the Examiner's rejection of Claims 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In the Office Action, the Examiner states that in Claims 13-15 it is "unclear of the relationship between the 'memory means,' 'first memory access means,' and the 'first storage location.'" See Office Action dated November 3, 2005, page 3. Applicants traverse that the relationship between memory means, first memory access means, and first storage location is unclear. From Applicants' Figure 1 and corresponding written description, the memory means is shown as 17, the first memory access means is shown as 18, the first storage location is shown as 22, the second storage location is shown as 23, the third storage location is shown as 24, and the second memory access means is shown as 33. The relationship between memory means, first memory access means, and first storage location are clearly shown in Figure 1 and the corresponding written description. The first, second, and third storage locations 22, 23, and 24 are shown as part of memory means 17 in Figure 1 and first memory access means 18 and second memory access means 33 are shown as separate from

memory means 17 in Figure 1. Therefore, Applicants believe Claims 13-15 are not indefinite in view of Applicants' Figure 1 and corresponding written description and therefore traverse the §112, second paragraph rejection and therefore no further amendment of Claims 13-15 is needed.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the currently pending claims are clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied references. Accordingly, entry of this amendment, reconsideration of the rejections of the claims over the references cited, and allowance of this application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By ADAM L. STROUD
Adam L. Stroud,
Reg. No. 48,410
Attorney
(408) 474-9064
February 2, 2006